

創価大学  
国際仏教学高等研究所  
年 報

平成 23 年度  
(第 15 号)

**Annual Report  
of  
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
at Soka University**

**for the Academic Year 2011**

**Volume XV**

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所  
東京・2012・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
Soka University  
Tokyo・2012

## On the Relationship between *saṃbhoga* and *ukkhepanīyakamma*

Haiyan Hu-von HINÜBER (Freiburg)

### §1. *Asaṃbhoga* as Punishment for Monks, Novices and Lay Followers

#### §1.1. The Meaning of *saṃbhoga*<sup>1</sup> and *asaṃbhoga*<sup>2</sup>

The commentary to Pācittiya 69 in the Suttavibhaṅga contains an explanation of the double meaning of the terms *saṃbhuñjeyya* and *saṃbhoga* in the following way:

*saṃbhuñjeyya vā 'ti, saṃbhogo nāma dve saṃbhogā āmisasaṃbhogo ca dhamma-saṃbhogo ca. āmisasaṃbhogo nāma āmisam deti vā paṭigaṇhāti vā, āpatti pācittiyassa. dhammasaṃbhogo nāma uddisati vā uddisāpeti vā. padena uddisati vā uddisāpeti vā, pade pade āpatti pācittiyassa. akkharāya uddisati vā uddisāpeti vā, akkhara-akkharāya āpatti pācittiyassa. (Vin IV 137,30-35)*<sup>3</sup>

“ ‘Or should enjoy with’ means: *saṃbhoga* implicates two (kinds of) communal enjoyment, both the communal enjoyment of the food (*āmisasaṃbhoga*) and the communal enjoyment of the teaching (*dhammasaṃbhoga*).<sup>4</sup> The communal enjoyment of food encompasses both, if he gives or accepts food, there is a Pācittiya offence. The communal enjoyment of teaching encompasses both: he recites (the Pātimokkhasutta) or causes to recite. If he recites or causes a word to be recited, for every word there is a Pācittiya offence. If he recites or causes a syllable to be recited, for every syllable there is a Pācittiya offence.”<sup>5</sup>

Additionally, the three categories of identity for the members of the Saṃgha, as mentioned in Pācittiya 69 (Vin IV 137,16-19) should be noted here:

- a) *saṃbhuñjeyya*,
- b) *saṃvāseyya* and
- c) *saha seyyam kappeya*.

<sup>1</sup> Spoken by Caillat, *Expiations*, p. 38ff. ; cf. Hu-von Hinüber, *Sambhoga. Die Zugehörigkeit zur Ordensgemeinschaft beim frühen Jainismus und Buddhismus*, Tokyo 2012 (forthcoming).

<sup>2</sup> The CPD defines *a-sambhoga* as both a substantive and an adjective: 1 *a-sambhoga*, m.: “exclusion from common life (with instr.)”: Vin II 21,22ff.; II 125,14ff.; 2 *a-sambhoga*, mfn.: “excluded from intercourse (with instr.)”: Vin II 125,38-126,2.

<sup>3</sup> The same definition can also be found in Vin IV 139,31-34 with the same commentary in 140,17-18 (abbreviated).

<sup>4</sup> *Samantapāsādikā* 870,20-32 hardly mentions it.

<sup>5</sup> My translation differs sometimes from that by I. B. Horner.

Generally speaking, *sambhoga* 共利養<sup>6</sup> means “having the right to share in the communal benefits” and *asambhoga* 別利養<sup>7</sup> “exclusion from receiving a share of the communal benefits”, which includes food and clothing provided by laity and distributed by the Saṃgha.

### §1.2. Pācittiya Rule 68-69

The context for the above-mentioned explanation of *sambhuñjeyya* is to be found in the previous Pācittiya rule No. 68, dealing with the monk Ariṭṭha, previously a vulture-trainer (*gaddhabādhi*)<sup>8</sup> who had a damaging and false view (*pāpakam diṭṭhigataṃ upannaṃ*, Vin IV 134,<sub>1</sub>), which is explained in the following words:

*tathāhaṃ bhagavatā dhammaṃ desitaṃ ājānāmi yathā ye 'me antarāyikā dhammā vuttā bhagavatā te paṭisevato nālaṃ antrāyāyā 'hi.* (Vin IV 134,<sub>1,4</sub>)

“In so far as I understand the Dhamma taught by the Blessed One, those things the Blessed One says are obstructive (to salvation) (*antarāyikā dhammā*), are not obstructive at all for persons indulged in.”

Upon which Buddha once again instructs Ariṭṭha in the *antarāyikā dhammā* and adds that it is a Pācittiya offence when a monk, despite three warnings<sup>9</sup> from his brothers, refuses to give up this false view:

*evaṃ ca pana so bhikkhu bhikkhūhi vuccamāno tath' eva paggaṇheyya, so bhikkhu bhikkhūhi yāvatatiyaṃ samanubhāsitaṃ tassa paṭinissaggāya. yāvatatiyaṃ ce samanubhāsīyamāno taṃ paṭinissajjeyya, icc etaṃ kusalam. no ce paṭinissajjeyya, pācittiyaṃ ti.* (Vin IV 135,<sub>25-30</sub>)

“And if that monk, when he has been spoken of thus by the monks, should persist as before, that monk should be admonished by the monks up to the third time for giving up that (course). If, being admonished up to the third time, he should give it up, that is good. But if he should not give it up, there is an offence of expiation.” (Horner III 25)

Pācittiya 69 deals with the group of six mischievous monks who were known for their deliberate wrongdoing. Despite being aware of Ariṭṭha's reticence to respond to

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the *Dharmaguptaka-Vinaya* 四分律, Taishō, vol. 22, p. 820a27 ff.: 共一利養 or 同一利養 and Wogihara s.v. *sambhoga*: 受、食、財、受用 etc.

<sup>7</sup> According to the *Dharmaguptaka-Vinaya* 四分律, Taishō, vol. 22, p. 820a26 ff.; cf. also Wogihara s.v. *asambhoga*: 不同受用.

<sup>8</sup> The meaning of this Pāli word, often translated as “vulture-trainer” is not clear.

<sup>9</sup> The brothers of the Order should reply to such a monk: *so bhikkhu bhikkhūhi evaṃ assa vacanīyo: māyasmā evaṃ avaca, mā bhagavantaṃ abbhācikkhi, na hi sādhu bhagavato abbhakkhānaṃ, na hi bhagavā evaṃ vadēyya* (Vin IV 135,<sub>21-23</sub>); cf. also §1.3 to Cullavagga I.32. As we know, the *pāpikā diṭṭhi* propagated by Ariṭṭha constitutes a denial of Buddha's teachings about the particularities which would be a hindrance to salvation (*antarāyikā dhammā*), and as such represents a fundamental questioning of belief in Buddhism.

admonitions and failure to give up his false views, the six monks knowingly used to eat together with Ariṭṭha (*sambhuñjanti*), carry out community matters (*saṃvāsanti*)<sup>10</sup> with and lie down in the same place with him.<sup>11</sup>

*chabbaggiyā bhikkhū jānaṃ tathāvādinā Ariṭṭhena bhikkhunā akaṭānudhammena taṃ diṭṭhiṃ appaṭinissaṭṭhena saddhiṃ sambhuñjanti pi saṃvāsanti pi sahāpi seyyaṃ kappenti.* (Vin IV 137,4-7)

As a consequence, Buddha says:

*yo pana bhikkhu jānaṃ tathāvādinā bhikkhunā akaṭānudhammena taṃ diṭṭhiṃ appaṭinissaṭṭhena saddhiṃ sambhuñjeyya vā saṃvāseyya vā saha vā seyyaṃ kappeyya, pācittiyaṃ ti.* (Vin IV 137,17-20)

“Whatever monk should knowingly eat together with or be in communion with or lie down in a sleeping place with a monk who talks thus, who has not acted according to the rule, who has not given up that view, there is an offence of expiation.” (Horner III 27-28)<sup>12</sup>

### §1.3. The Case of the Monk Ariṭṭha discussed in Cullavagga I.32

The abovementioned Pācittiya 68 only cites the case of a Pācittiya offence when a monk does not change such a false view after three warnings. In the immediately following Pācittiya 69, which is an extension of Pācittiya 68, it is required of other monks not to have any interaction with a monk who has been disobedient according to the Pācittiya 68.

The accompanying suspension procedure *ukkhepanīyakamma*<sup>13</sup> (舉罪羯磨<sup>14</sup>) against Ariṭṭha, from which the introduction story of Pācittiya 69 draws,<sup>15</sup> is, however, not

<sup>10</sup> This terminology is defined in the following section (Pācittiya 69; Vin IV 138,1,2) as: *saṃvāseyya vā 'hi ukkhittakena saddhiṃ uposathaṃ vā pavāraṇaṃ vā saṃghakammaṃ vā karoti, āpatti pācittiyaassa*; see also *Samantapāsādikā* 1391,2,3 *asaṃvāso ti uposatha-pavāraṇādinā saṃvāsena asaṃvāso*. This technical meaning of *saṃvāsati* further clearly illustrates the casuistry of Pācittiya 70 (Vin IV 139,31-34), where our term does not appear, because the case in that instance dealing with a novice who has no right to participate in *saṃghakammas*.

<sup>11</sup> It deals with *utkṣiptānūvṛtti*, see Mvy 8480: *spanṣ-paḥi rjes-su phyogs-pa* 棄則隨方、與遣者相黨 and Wogihara s.v.

<sup>12</sup> According to the Parivāra (an addendum to the Vinaya), a monk commits a Dukkaṭa offence while eating with a guilty monk, and a Pācittiya offence once he has eaten with the guilty party: *jānaṃ tathāvādinā bhikkhunā akaṭānudhammena taṃ diṭṭhiṃ appaṭinissaṭṭhena saddhiṃ sambhuñjanto dve āpattiyo āpajjati; sambhuñjati payoge dukkaṭaṃ, sambhutte āpatti pācittiyaassa* (Vin V 41,36-38). Additionally, Pācittiya 69 is taken up in the first chapter of the Parivāra (Vin V 23,29-35) under the category *ekā paññatti ... tihi samuṭṭhānehi samuṭṭhāti : jānaṃ tathāvādinā bhikkhunā akaṭānudhammena taṃ diṭṭhiṃ appaṭinissaṭṭhena saddhiṃ sambhuñjantassa pācittiyaṃ ... Sāvatthiyā paññattaṃ ... chabbaggiye bhikkhū ārabha ... chabbaggiyā bhikkhū jānaṃ tathāvādinā Ariṭṭhena bhikkhunā akaṭānudhammena taṃ diṭṭhiṃ appaṭinissaṭṭhena saddhiṃ sambhuñjimsu ... ekā paññatti ... tihi samuṭṭhānehi samuṭṭhāti*.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. CPD s.v. *ukkhepanīya*, mfn. “leading to suspension”: Vin I 49,34; Ps II 382,18; -*kamma*, n.: Vin I 326,3; II 27,24; A I 98,8 etc.; see also Upasak, *Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastic Terms*, s.v. *ukkhepanīyakamma*, BHSD s.v. *utkṣipati*: (2) (= Pali *ukkipati*) “suspends (from the order of monks)” and SWTF s.v. *ut-kṣepanīya*.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Hirakawa, BCSD 1510, p. 565b: 舉罪羯磨 *utkṣepanīyakarman*; see also Mvy 8646: *utkṣepanīyam: gnas nas dbyuñ-ba* 除卻 and Wogihara s.v. *ut-kṣepanīya*: 舉、除卻、應除卻.

<sup>15</sup> At the end of Pācittiya 69 the following casuistry is found in six cases (IV 138,8-13): (a) *ukkhittake*

handled in the Mahāvibhaṅga directly, instead this can be found in another part of the Vinaya, the Cullavagga, because all the procedural rules are collected in the Khandhaka.<sup>16</sup>

We thus find the legal consequence of Pācittiya 68 according to the Buddhist view in Cullavagga I.32.1-4 (Vin II 25,<sup>10-27,18</sup>), where the record of the *ukkhepanīyakamma* against the monk Ariṭṭha is introduced. Initially the brothers of the Saṃgha speak to Ariṭṭha as ordained by the Buddha in Pācittiya 68, saying:<sup>17</sup>

*māvuso Ariṭṭha evaṃ avaca, mā bhagavantam abbhācikkhi, na hi sādhu bhagavato abbhakkhānam, na hi bhagavā evaṃ vadeyya* (Vin II 25,<sup>26-28</sup>).

“Do not speak thus, reverend Ariṭṭha, do not misrepresent the Lord; misrepresentation of the Lord is not at all seemly, and the Lord certainly would not speak thus.” (Horner V 36)

The wording at this point is, aside from the salutation *āvuso Ariṭṭha*, identical to that of Pācittiya 68<sup>18</sup>. The thus addressed Ariṭṭha, however, reiterates his erroneous viewpoint, to which he continues to cling stubbornly.<sup>19</sup>

In this way the other monks find themselves unable to convince Ariṭṭha of his error (*nāsakkhimsu Ariṭṭham ... vivecetum* Vin II 26,<sup>10-11</sup>).<sup>20</sup> The monks turn to Buddha for instruction, and he summons the Saṃgha together. After rebuking and instructing Ariṭṭha (*vigarahitvā dhammiṃ katham katvā* 26,<sup>29-30</sup>) he orders the following (Cullavagga II.32.3):

*tena hi bhikkhave saṃgho Ariṭṭhassa bhikkhuno gaddhabādhipubbassa pāpikāya diṭṭhiyā appaṭinissagge ukkhepanīyakammaṃ karotu asaṃbhogaṃ saṃghena* (Vin II 26,<sup>30-33</sup>).

“Monks! Let the Order, therefore, carry out a procedure of suspension against the monk Ariṭṭha who was formerly a vulture-trainer, if he does not give up his false view; this means: (he will) no (longer have any) right to share in the communal sustenance with the Order.”

The fourth and last section of Cullavagga II.32 informs us as to how the procedure *ukkhepanīyakamma* is to be carried out. After Ariṭṭha is criticized, admonished and

---

*ukkhattakasaññī saṃbhuñjati vā saṃvāsati vā saha vā seyyaṃ kappeti, āpatti pācittiyassa.* (b) *ukkhattake vematiko ... āpatti dukkaṭassa.* (c) *ukkhattake anukkhattakasaññī ... anāpatti.* (d) *anukkhattake ukkhattakasaññī, āpatti dukkaṭassa.* (e) *anukkhattake vematiko, āpatti dukkaṭassa.* (f) *anukkhattake anukkhattakasaññī, anāpatti.*

<sup>16</sup> Cf. O. von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, p. 15-21.

<sup>17</sup> The text in the Cullavagga reads *avocum*: “to appeal” rather than “admonish” *samanubhāsati* as in the Suttavibhaṅga, and calls Ariṭṭha *āvuso* (Vin II 25,<sup>26</sup>) and not *āyasmā* (Vin IV 135,<sup>18</sup>).

<sup>18</sup> The conventional address there is *āyasmā*.

<sup>19</sup> Vin II 26,<sup>4-7</sup>: *evaṃ pi kho Ariṭṭho bhikkhu gaddhabādhipubbo tehi bhikkhūhi vuccamāno tath’ eva tam pāpakaṃ diṭṭhigataṃ thāmasā parāmassa abhinivissa voharati: evaṃ byā kho aham ...*

<sup>20</sup> In the text of the Cullavagga it is not explicitly noted that the monk should be warned three times, as is required in Pācittiya 68.

charged with his offence (*codetvā ... sāretvā ... āpattiṃ ropetvā* Vin II 26,<sup>35-36</sup>), he is to be expelled from the Saṃgha through a *ñatticatudiya* process (27,<sup>5-18</sup>), in which a motion is lodged (*ñatti* 26,<sup>37-27,5</sup>) and a proclamation (*dutiyaṃ pi ... tatiyaṃ pi etam atthaṃ vadāmi* 27,<sup>13-14</sup>) is repeated three times.<sup>21</sup>

#### §1.4. The Case of the Monk Channa discussed in Cullavagga I.25

In Cullavagga I.25.1-2 another case is recorded where the *ukkhepanīyakamma* is used. Here is made mention of the monk Channa, who had committed an offence but did not want to admit it:

*āpattiṃ āpajjitvā na icchati āpattiṃ passitum* (Vin II 21,<sup>7</sup>)

Here too Buddha orders:

*tena hi bhikkhave saṃgho Channassa bhikkhuno āpattiyaṃ adassane ukkhepanīya-kammaṃ karotu asambhogaṃ saṃghena* (Vin II 21,<sup>19-21</sup>).

“Monks! Let the Order, therefore, carry out a procedure of suspension against the monk Channa, if he does not admit his offence; this means: (he will) no (longer have any) right to share in the communal sustenance with the Order.”

The motion (*ñatti*) and the following proclamations have the same wording: *ukkhepanīya-kammaṃ kareyya / karoti asambhogaṃ saṃghena* (21,<sup>28</sup> and <sup>31-32</sup>), while the questioning of the Saṃgha by the monk in charge of the procedure is: *yassāyasmato ... ukkhepanīyassa kammassa karaṇaṃ asambhogaṃ saṃghena* (21,<sup>33-34</sup>). The final sentence of the procedure is also notable: *Channo ... ukkhepanīyakammakato asambhogaṃ saṃghenā 'ti* (22,<sup>5-6</sup>).

The Cullavagga I.26-27 teaches the legal grounds for an *ukkhepanīyakamma*. The text in I.28.1 (Vin II 23,<sup>5-23</sup>) tells the story of how the expelled monk Channa had to leave the Āvāsa in Kosambi where he had lived, and how he wandered to three further Āvāsas where he was not taken in (*tattha bhikkhū n' eva abhivādesuṃ na paccutthesuṃ na añjalikammaṃ na sāmīcīkammaṃ akaṃsu na sakkariṃsu na gurukariṃsu na mānesuṃ na pūjesuṃ* 23,<sup>7-11</sup>). Eventually Channa had to return to Kosambi. He repented and showed his contrition and willingness to better himself (*sammāvatthāmi lomaṃ pātemi netthāraṃ*

<sup>21</sup> The above articulated punishment *asambhoga*, described in both Pācittiya 68-69 and Cullavagga I.32, was also applied to novices (*samanuddesa*) who shared the same erroneous view of Buddha's teachings. This is the case of the novice Kaṇḍaka, recorded in Pācittiya 70 (Vin IV 138,<sup>17-140,37</sup>). The first part of Pācittiya 70 (138,<sup>17-139,4</sup>; until Buddha's decision to expel Kaṇḍaka from the Order) is very similar to Cullavagga I.32 concerning the monk Ariṭṭha. However, because this case concerns a novice, he received only one warning, whereas Ariṭṭha was given three. And the novice Kaṇḍaka could be directly expelled from the Saṃgha (*nāsesi*), without the necessity to go through the extended process of an *ukkhepanīya-kamma*. The Pācittiya 70 has, (except for the *saṃvāseyya*, here replaced by *upalāpeyya* and *upaṭṭhāpeyya*, because a novice has no rights to participate in the *saṃghakammās*), the same wording as Pācittiya 69 (Vin IV 137,<sup>17-20</sup>); esp. the explanation of the *saṃbhūñjeyya* in the Vibhaṅga to Pācittiya 70 (Vin IV 140,<sup>17-18</sup>) is identical to Pācittiya 69. Similar casuistry can be observed in six different cases (Vin IV 140,<sup>24-29</sup>; *nāsitake ... anāpatti*). For details of the boycott process against the lay person Vaḍḍha (Cullavagga V.20) cf. Hu-von Hinüber, *Sambhoga: Die Zugehörigkeit zur Ordensgemeinschaft beim frühen Jainismus und Buddhismus*, Tokyo 2012 (forthcoming).

*vattāmi* 23,19-20). As a result, the Buddha allowed the Order to which Channa belonged to lift the *ukkhepanīyakamma* (*paṭippassambhetu* 23,23).

## §2. *Ukkhepanīyakamma* according to Mahāvagga I.79

We learn from Mahāvagga I.79.1-4 (Vin I 97,19-98,24) that there are three grounds for an *ukkhepanīyakamma*:

- 1) 79.1-2: He did not acknowledge his offence  
*āpattiya adasanne* (Vin I 97,19);<sup>22</sup>
- 2) 79.3: He did not repent for his offence  
*āpattiya appaṭikkame* (Vin I 97,34);
- 3) 79.4: He did not give up his false view  
*pāpikāya diṭṭhiya appaṭinissagge* (Vin I 98,10).<sup>23</sup>

It is clear that the grounds given in Mahāvagga I.79.1-3 are closely linked to Cullavagga I.25-28 (§1.4), and that the refusal to give up a false view mentioned in Mahāvagga I.79.4 is linked to both Pācittiya 68-69 and Cullavagga I.32 (§1.2-3). The Mahāvagga further shows that an *ukkhepanīyakamma*, like every *saṃghakamma*,<sup>24</sup> requires the full attendance (*sāmaggī*) of the Order (see below: e).

The abovementioned three cases, *āpattiya adasanne*, *āpattiya appaṭikkame* and *pāpikāya diṭṭhiya appaṭinissagge*, are all handled in a similar way in Mahāvagga I.79 and consist of the following formal steps:

### [a] (Renewed) inclusion (in the Saṃgha, *pabbājījā*)

When the expelled monk returns to the Saṃgha and requests the (re)ordination (*so puna paccāgantvā bhikkhū upasampadam yācati*), he is to be asked if he acknowledges and repents for his offences or if he is prepared to give up his falsely held views (*so evam assa vacanīyo: passissasi/paṭikarissasi taṃ āpattin ti/paṭinissajjissasi taṃ pāpikaṃ diṭṭhin ti*). If he promises to do this, he may be reincorporated into the Order (*pabbājetabbo*); if he is unwilling to do this, he may not rejoin the Order (Vin I 97,21-26; 97,34-98; 98,10-15).

### [b] (Re)consecration of the monk (*upasampadā*)

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Hirakawa, *Ritsuzō no Kenkyū*, p. 82 with n. 51-52: Hoernle, *Manuscripts Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan*, p. 12: */// dṛṣṭipā(pikā)yā dṛṣṭyā utkṣepa(nī)yaṃ karma*. It should be noted that neither Mahāvagga I.79.1-3 or the related passage in Cullavagga I.25-28 makes explicit which offence (*āpatti*) this would be.

<sup>23</sup> Nolot, “Studies in Vinaya technical terms IV-X”, p. 2ff. discussed this threefold *ukkhepanīyakamma* in great detail. The most noteworthy difference to the four *pārājikas* is that the *ukkhepanīyakamm* indicates a far milder punishment, which details that a reconsecration to the monkhood *upasampadā*, followed by rehabilitation (*osāraṇā*) remain possible, which is not the case when an offence is committed against one of the four *Pārājika* rules.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Nolot, “Studies in Vinaya technical terms I-III”, p. 73-91.

After he has rejoined the Saṃgha (*pabbājetvā*), he should be asked if he will keep his promise. If he repeats the promise (*°āhaṃ passissāmīti/paṭikarissāmīti/paṭinissajjissāmīti*), he may be reconsecrated (*upasampādetabbo*); if not, then he may not be reconsecrated (Vin I 97,<sup>26-28</sup>; 98,<sup>1-4</sup>; 98,<sup>15-18</sup>).

[c] Rehabilitation (*osāraṇā*)

After he has been reconsecrated (*upasampādetvā*), he should again, for the third time, be asked if he intends to continue to hold his promises. If yes, he may, under the condition of his regained status as a monk, be rehabilitated (*osāretabbo*); if not, he may not be reinstated as a monk.

[d] An acknowledgement of and repentance for the offence (*āpattiṃ passati/paṭikaroti*) as well as giving up the false views (*pāpikaṃ diṭṭhiṃ paṭinissajjati*)

After the rehabilitation (*osāretvā*) the promises which had been recited three times (in the future tense) need to be reiterated in the present actuality. The rehabilitated monk is to be told: “Do you acknowledge your offence?” and “Repent of your offence!” as well as “Give up your false views!” (Vin I 97,<sup>31</sup> *passasi taṃ āpattiṃ ti*: present indicative; 98,<sup>6-7</sup> *paṭikarohi taṃ āpattiṃ ti* and 98,<sup>21</sup> *paṭinissajjāhi taṃ pāpikaṃ diṭṭhiṃ ti*: present imperative).

[e] (Or else once again) suspension (from the Order, *ukkhepanā*)

If the monk refuses to do what is required of him, he will be once again expelled from the Order, as long as the members of the Order are all in attendance. If the full attendance of the Saṃgha is not immediately possible, it is not a transgression for the other members of the Saṃgha to continue to partake of and practice both the *saṃbhoga* and *saṃvāsa* with the offending Monk who would be expelled for the interim:

*sace passati/paṭikaroti/paṭinissajjati, icc etaṃ kusalaṃ, no ce passati/paṭikaroti/paṭinissajjati, labbhamānāya sāmaggīyā puna ukkhipitabbo, alabbhamānāya sāmaggīyā anāpatti saṃbhoge saṃvāse* (Vin I 97,<sup>31-34</sup>; 98,<sup>7-10</sup>; 98,<sup>22-24</sup>).<sup>25</sup>

### §3.1. The close Relationship between *asaṃbhoga*, *asaṃvāsa* and *ukkhepanā*

From §§1-3 it becomes apparent that the *ukkhepanīyakamma* is a formal means of social boycott through the legal consequence *asaṃbhoga* and *asaṃvāsa*, although *asaṃbhoga* is related to the shared material resources, while *asaṃvāsa* addresses the participation in various legal procedures. In other words, an *ukkhepanīyakamma* always leads to the punishment of *asaṃbhoga*. The exact formulation being:

***ukkhepanīyakammaṃ karotu asaṃbhogaṃ saṃghena*** (see §1.3: Cullavagga I.32)

<sup>25</sup> One of the two references to *saṃbhoga* in the *Samantapāsādikā* relates to the issue at hand: p. 1034,<sup>12-17</sup> *alabbhamānāya sāmaggīyā anāpatti saṃbhoge saṃvāse* ‘i yāva tassa ukkhepanīya-kammakaraṇatthāya sāmaggī na labbhati, tāva tena saddhiṃ saṃbhoge ca uposathapavāraṇādikaraṇabhede saṃvāse ca anāpatti’i sesaṃ sabbattha Mahāvibhaṅge vuttānusārena suviññeyyattā pākāṭam evā ‘i.



From the above quoted text of Mahāvagga I.79 concerning the complete attendance of the Saṃgha *alabbhamānāya sāmaggīyā anāpatti saṃbhoga saṃvāse* (§2), it is apparent that both technical terms *saṃbhoga* and *saṃvāsa* are of equal legal significance and closely linked to one another. So far it can be taken for sure that *saṃbhoga* as well as *saṃvāsa* (meaning the communal implementation of *uposatha*, *pavāraṇa* and *saṃghakamma*) had a central importance in early Buddhist Vinaya.<sup>26</sup>

### §3.2. The transmission of the *ukkhepanīyakamma*

As pointed out by Oskar von Hinüber, the “original” source of the text concerning Aritṭha is the opening paragraph of the 22. Alagaddūpamasuttanta of the Majjhimanikāya (I 130-142), which was first incorporated into the Cullavagga and later on into the Suttavibhaṅga.<sup>27</sup>

However, the *ukkhepanīyakamma* concerning the monk Aritṭha was discussed in the Cullavagga and not in the Suttavibhaṅga. Possibly it indicates that this paragraph had been taken from the Cullavagga and inserted into the Suttavibhaṅga during a later redaction of the Vinayaṭṭaka. This assumption can be further supported by the glossary of key words *uddāna* which belongs to the respective Vibhaṅga texts, as *uddānas* are sometimes older than the text itself. In the *uddāna* from Pācittiya 61-70 which can be found at the end of Pācittiya 70, the key word for Pācittiya 69 is *ukkhita*, meaning “expelled”:

*dasamaṃ. tass’ uddānaṃ:*  
*sañciccavadha-sappāṇaṃ, ukko, duṭṭhullachādanam,*  
*ūvavīsati, satthañ ca, saṃvidhāna-Āriṭṭhakam,*  
***ukkhita**-Kaṇḍakañ c’ eva dasa sikkhāpadā ime ’ti.*  
*sappāṇakavaggo sattamo (Vin IV 140,<sup>32-37</sup>).*

It is likely that both terms *saṃbhoga* and *asaṃbhoga*, especially with regard to their close relationship to the *ukkhepanīyakamma*, are part of an earlier Vinaya terminology. It seems, however, that they lost much of their importance in course of time. For, already in older texts these terms are not frequently mentioned and appear to have been slowly lost sight of. If this is truth, it would be perhaps easier to understand why there are only very few references to them in later literature.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Parivāra XVIII (Vin V 216,1-3): *sāgāraṇa* is allowed.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. O. von Hinüber, *Das Pātimokkhasutta der Theravādin*, p. 54-70 (IV.3 Das Khandhaka und die Regeln des Pātimokkhasutta), esp. p. 66-70 (IV.3.2.2 Die Pācittiyas LXVIII bis LXXIII): „Als der ‘ursprüngliche’ Sitz des auf Aritṭha bezüglichen Textes gilt die Anfangsstelle von 22. Alagaddūpamasuttanta des Majjhimanikāya (I 130-142). Darauf folgt zunächst die Eingliederung in den Cullavagga und schließlich in den Suttavibhaṅga mit dem Pātimokkha“; see also Schlingloff, “Zur Interpretation des Prātimokṣasūtra”, p. 538f.

<sup>28</sup> E.g. both terms are not longer mentioned in the Mvy.

**Bibliography and Abbreviations:**

- BHSD = Edgerton, F., *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. 2: *Dictionary*, New Haven 1953.
- Buddhaghosa, *Samantapāsādikā* (*Vinayaṇṇanā*, *Vinayaṭṭhakathā*), *Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭṭaka*, ed. J. Takakusu, M. Nagai, K. Mizuno, H. Kopp, 8 vols., London (PTS) 1966-1982.
- Caillat, C., *Les expiations dans le rituel ancien des religieux Jaina*, Paris 1965 (PICI, Série in -8°, Facs. 25). [*Atonements in the Ancient Ritual of the Jaina Monks*, Ahmedabad 1975, L.D. Series 49.]
- CPD = *A Critical Pali Dictionary*, begun by V. Trenckner, ed. by D. Andersen, H. Smith a.o.; Copenhagen 1924-2011.
- Dharmagruptaka-Vinaya*, see *Sifen Lü*
- Hirakawa, A. 平川彰 (ed.), *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary* 佛教漢梵大辭典 [BCSD], Tōkyō 1997 (The Reiyukai 靈友會)
- Hirakawa, A. 平川彰, *律藏の研究* (*Ritsuzō no Kenkyū. A Study of the Vinaya-Piṭaka*), Tōkyō 1960.
- Hoernle, A.F. R., *Manuscripts Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan*, Oxford 1916.
- Horner, I. B. (translated), *The Book of the Discipline* (*Vinaya Piṭaka*), 6 vols., London 1938-1966 (*Sacred Books of the Buddhist* 10-11, 13-14, 20, 25).
- von Hinüber, O., *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Berlin/New York 1996 (*Indian Philology and South Asian Studies*, ed. by A. Wezler and M. Witzel, vol. 2).
- von Hinüber, O., *Das Pātimokkhasutta der Theravādin. Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus II*, Stuttgart 1999 (*Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz, Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, Jahrgang 1999, Nr. 6*).
- Hu-von Hinüber, H., *Sambhoga. Die Zugehörigkeit zur Ordensgemeinschaft beim frühen Jainismus und Buddhismus*, Tokyo 2012 (forthcoming).
- Mvy = *Mahāvīyutpatti* 翻譯名義大集, ed. R. Sakaki 榊亮三郎, 2 vols. Kyōto 1926.
- Nolot, É., "Studies in Vinaya technical terms I-III", in: *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, vol. 22, ed. by O. von Hinüber and R. F. Gombrich, Oxford 1996, p. 73-150.
- Nolot, É., "Studies in Vinaya technical terms IV-X", in: *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, vol. 25, ed. by O. von Hinüber and R. F. Gombrich, Oxford 1999, p. 1-111.
- Samantapāsādikā*, see Buddhaghosa.
- Schlingloff, D., "Zur Interpretation des Prātimokṣasūtra", in: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Band 113, Heft 3, Wiesbaden 1964, p. 536-551.
- Sifen Lü* 四分律 (*Dharmagruptaka-Vinaya*) in: *Taishō Sinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 (ed. by J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe, 100 vols., Tōkyō 1924ff.), No. 1428, vol. 22.
- SWTF = *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, begonnen von E. Waldschmidt, hrsg. von H. Bechert u.a., Göttingen 1973ff.
- Upasak, Ch. S., *Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastic Terms (based on Pāli Literature)*, Varanasi 1975.
- Vin = *The Vinaya Piṭakam. One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language*, ed. H. Oldenberg, 5 vols., London 1879-1183 (PTS). [repr. London 1964, PTS Text Sereis 147-148, 160-162].
- Wogihara, U. 荻原雲來 (ed.), *Kanyaku Taishō Bonwa Daijiten* 漢譯對照梵和大辭典, Tōkyō 1940-1974.